

Commissioner of Patents  
Page 8

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2006

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 15, 16, 19-22, 25, 26, 28 and 34-38 are pending in this application. In the April 6, 2006 Final Office Action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 15, 16, 19-22, 25, 26, 28 and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

B. Rejected claims 15, 19-22, 25, 26, 34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,573,776 to Miyamoto (hereinafter "Miyamoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,364 to Dortu et al. (hereinafter "Dortu").

C. Rejected claims 16, 28 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Miyamoto in view of Dortu in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,183 to Li et al. (hereinafter, "Li").

In this response, applicants have amended claims 15 and 22. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments place the claims in a condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit reconsideration of pending claims 15, 16, 19-22, 25, 26, 28 and 34-38 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections Should Be Withdrawn

The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 16, 19-22, 25, 26, 28 and 34-38 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for allegedly containing limitations not disclosed in the specification and/or drawings. In particular, independent claims 15 and 22 were rejected for the limitations "a low frequency delay element" and "a high frequency delay element."

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2006

Commissioner of Patents  
Page 9

Applicant has replaced these expressions with the expression "different second delay elements in discrete steps for different frequency ranges, at least one second delay element being for low frequencies of the externally generated clock signal and at least one further second delay element being for high frequencies of the externally generated clock signal."

The amendments to claims 15 and 22 do not constitute new matter. In particular, support for the amendments to these claims may be found in the specification on page 4, lines 19-26; page 9, lines 8-10; page 9, line 38 to page 10, line 5; page 10, lines 5-10; and page 11, lines 9-13. Because the limitations "a low frequency delay element" and "a high frequency delay element" have been deleted from the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 15, 16, 19-22, 25, 26, 28 and 34-38 should be withdrawn.

### III. Independent Claims 15 and 22 are Patentable Over the Prior Art

In the April 6, 2006 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 15 and 22 as being allegedly being unpatentable over Miyamoto in view of Dortu. For reasons discussed below in detail, it is respectfully submitted that obviousness rejection of claims 15 and 22, as amended, should be withdrawn.

#### A. Claim 15

Claim 15 is directed to a delay lock loop apparatus which can be adapted for use with a broad range of externally generated clock signals. The apparatus includes a delay device, a feedback device, a frequency detection device and a phase difference detection device. The delay device comprises first and second delay elements. As amended, the second delay element comprises different second delay elements for different frequency ranges. At least